

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States, Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

				•
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,927	10/10/2000	Hideki Usuki	DAIN: 563	2321
7590 10/16/2003			EXAMINER	
PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.			XU, LING X	
1421 Prince Str	eet, Suite 210			
Alexandria, VA 22314-2805			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	91
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/200	₃

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
		USUKI ET AL.
Advisory Action	09/684,927 Examin r	Art Unit
	Ling X. Xu	1775
The MAILING DATE f this communicatio	_	
REPLY FILED 22 September 2003 FAILS TO refore, further action by the applicant is require rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be eith dition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of mination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	O PLACE THIS APPLICATION of to avoid abandonment of this her: (1) a timely filed amendment of this Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. s application. A proper reply to a ent which places the application in
	OR REPLY [check either a) or	b)]
The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mai		
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date no event, however, will the statutory period for reply ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(lave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the onder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration is set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	expire later than SIX MONTHS from the LY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHAM. a). The date on which the petition undeperiod of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period the Office later than three months after than three months.	the mailing date of the final rejection. HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP there 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension ding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension for reply originally set in the final Office action; or
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appe 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (3	ellant's Brief must be filed withi 37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid disr	n the period set forth in nissal of the appeal.
The proposed amendment(s) will not be enter	ered because:	
(a) they raise new issues that would require	e further consideration and/or s	earch (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see	Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the applic issues for appeal; and/or	ation in better form for appeal	by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without of NOTE:	canceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.
Applicant's reply has overcome the following	rejection(s):	
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	would be allowable if submitted	d in a separate, timely filed amendment
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) [the application in condition for allowal The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ance because: <u>See Continuation</u> ed because it is not directed SC	Sheet.
For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amenexplanation of how the new or amended cla		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	llows:	
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 4-9.		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.
Note the attached Information Disclosure Sta	atement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)
Other:		

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 is not sufficient to overcome the prior art rejection set forth in the prior office action because the data shown (see Table 2) do not indicate the claimed range of 3-10% of microsilica in the adhesive layer has unexpected results. Therefore, it is the position of the examiner that the rejection is still appropriate and is herein maintained.

2%